



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

XO

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,540	02/08/2002	James Arthur Hoffmann	X-11368A	4243
25885	7590	08/25/2005	EXAMINER	
ELI LILLY AND COMPANY PATENT DIVISION P.O. BOX 6288 INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46206-6288			DELACROIX MUIRHEI, CYBILLE	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1614		

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/072,540	HOFFMANN, JAMES ARTHUR
	Examiner Cybille Delacroix-Muirheid	Art Unit 1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2005 and 13 June 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 35-54 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 35-54 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/08/05</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

The following is responsive to the request for continued examination, amendment and declaration received June 8, 2005 and June 13, 2005.

The applications listed on the 1449 received June 8, 2005 were not considered as they were not available to the examiner. The applications will be considered once they have been made available to the examiner.

The previous rejection of claims 35-54 under 35 USC 103(a) over Knudsen et al., 6,458,924 maintained in the office action mailed Jan. 11, 2005 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment, declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 and the remarks contained therein.

The declaration and Exhibits filed on June 8, 2005 and June 13, 2005 under 37 CFR 1.131 is sufficient to overcome the Knudsen et al., 6,458,924 reference.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1. Claims 35-54 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,358,924 ('924) in view of Knudsen et al., 6,458,924.

USPN '924 claims a stable pharmaceutical formulation comprising a GLP-I compound (SEQ ID NO; 1, 4, 5) or derivative thereof, an anionic surfactant and preservative, wherein the pH of the composition, which is in solution form, ranges from 6.5 to 9.0. USPN '924 additionally claims a method for treating a person having a condition for which administration of a GLP-I compound is indicated by administering an effective amount of the claimed formulation.

USPN '924 does not claim a formulation containing a buffer and a tween polymeric surfactant. However, the Examiner refers to Knudsen et al., which disclose a stable pharmaceutical composition containing a GLP-I derivative as well as a preservative, a buffer and a surfactant, wherein the surfactant may be a polymeric Tween surfactant or an anionic surfactant. Please see col. 153, lines 45-66; col. 154, lines 36-37; col. 156, lines 28-29 and lines 62-67; col. 157, lines 5-12; col. 204, line 65 to col. 205, line 4.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the claimed composition of USPN '924 to substitute the anionic surfactants with a polymeric Tween surfactant because one of ordinary skill in the art, based on Knudsen's disclosure, would reasonably expect a tween surfactant to be equally effective in stabilizing the GLP-I containing formulations.

Claim Objection(s)

2. Claim 53 is objected to because of the following informalities: in claim 53, lines 1-2, the phrase "treating a person having a condition for which administration of a GLP-1 compound to patients with elevated glucose levels" is awkwardly written and should be rephrased. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejection(s)—35 USC 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 53-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 53 recites the limitation "to patients" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Conclusion

Claims 35-54 are rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Cybille Delacroix-Muirheid** whose telephone number is **571-272-0572**. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs. from 8:30 to 6:00 as well as every other Friday from 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Christopher Low**, can be reached on **571-272-0951**. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1614

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CDM



Aug. 21, 2005



Cybille Delacroix-Muirheid
Patent Examiner Group 1600